

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

1. Interview Summary

At the interview, proposed changes to claim 1 were discussed in order to more particularly describe the value document substrate. It was agreed that U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) used to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) does not disclose a value document substrate comprising a first paper layer and a second paper layer. It was also agreed that U.S. patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*) used to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) does not disclose the aforementioned features added to claim

2. In the claims

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the value document substrate comprises a first paper layer and a second paper layer. Support for this amendatory language can be found at least in paragraph [0055] and in Fig. 4.

Claim 35 was amended to correct its dependency in light of the previous cancellation of claim 13.

The claims are now considered to be placed in condition for allowance.

No new matter is introduced via the amendment to the claims.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

3. Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19, 32, and 35 as being obvious in view of U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) and U.S. patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*)

In view of the amendment to claim 1, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Moreover, the claims dependent from claim 1 are likewise in condition for allowance in view of their dependency from claim 1 and their individually recited features. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the discussion at the interview.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a value document with at least two different feature substances for checking the value document, where the value document substrate comprises a first paper layer and a second paper layer.

The proposed combination of the *Bratchley* and the *Soules* patents fails to teach or suggest that the value document substrate comprises a first paper layer and a second paper layer. The *Bratchley* patent teaches a document of value with a high security entity (HSE) and a low security entity (LSE). The two entities are incorporated into the substrate during manufacture of the substrate or the entities may be printed on the substrate. The *Bratchley* reference does not teach that the substrate has multiple paper layers.

The *Soules* patent teaches playing cards containing a code on the surface of the card to enable the machine identification of the value of the playing card. The *Soules* patent does not teach a value document with at least two feature different feature substances and a value document substrate with a first paper layer and a second paper layer.

It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a value document with at least two inventive feature substances and a value document substrate with a first paper layer and a second paper layer based on the teachings of the *Bratchley* and the *Soules* patents. The *Bratchley* patent teaches that the HSE or LSE may be a security thread or materials incorporated into a single substrate. The HSE is a single mixture with multiple components. The *Soules* patent does not teach feature substances. Thus, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a single mixture into multiple paper layers.

Accordingly, the combination of the *Bratchley* and the *Soules* patents fails to teach all of the features of amended claim 1, and thus, a prima facie case of obviousness can not be established with respect to amended claim 1, from which the remaining claims depend.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

4. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*), U.S. patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*), and EP-B-0 052 624 (*Kaule*)

Claim 7 is dependent from claim 1 and is likewise in condition for allowance for the reasons above in view of its dependency from claim 1 and its individually

recited features. The *Kaule* publication does not correct the deficiencies of the *Bratchley* and the *Soules* patents, as discussed above.

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable at least on the basis of its dependency from claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

5. Rejection of Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*), U.S. patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*), and *Anti-Stokes Phosphors/Luminophors (ASPL)*

Claims 33 and 34 are dependent from claim 1 and are likewise in condition for allowance for the reasons above in view of their dependency from claim 1 and their individually recited features. The *ASPL* reference does not correct the deficiencies of the *Bratchley* and the *Soules* patents, as discussed above.

Accordingly, claims 33 and 34 are patentable at least on the basis of their dependency from claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

6. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: February 23, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 46,205